



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,855	11/02/1999	DESMOND E. WONG	0100.9901360	1672
23418	7590	06/15/2005	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			MENGISTU, AMARE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2673	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/432,855	WONG, DESMOND E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Amare Mengistu	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The **specification does not provide support** to the following claim limitations as originally filed.

In claim 1, line 2 the recitation of the claim "**monitoring a first pin of a connector**";

Lines 4-5, "**asserting a first output signal to indicate the first pin is a first state; and receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display engine**";

In claim 5 lines 1-2, the phrase "**a first input**";

In claim 6, the phrase "**wherein the step of determining includes. ...When the input is stable for a predetermined amount of time**", and;

In claim 10, lines 2-3 "**the first node**".

Claim Objections

2. Claim 10, lines 2-3 is objected to because of the following informalities: " **the first node**" should have been "**the first pin**". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5,10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 5,10, and 13 recite the limitation "**the steps of** " in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2673

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1,4,11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lvovsky et al** (5,159,683).

As to claims 1,11-13 **Lvovsky et al** clearly teaches a method for detecting a monitor the method comprising: monitoring the first node of a connector coupling to a flat panel display (fig.2 (36), col.2, lines 10 –14,lines 51-59), asserting a first output signal to indicate the first node is in a first state (col.2, lines 14-17); first state is indicative of a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector (col.2, lines 20-24).

Lvovsky et al did not expressly detailed that receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display engine. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognize that the controller (here note, controller (30) is interpreted as a display engine) receives the first output signal (see, col.2, lines 7-15, 57-59).

As to claim 4, **Lvovsky et al** clearly states that a first output signal is stored in a buffer (fig.2 (32)). Which is equivalent to applicant's register.

8. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lvovsky et al** in view of **Verdun et al** (6,493,782)

As to claims 2,3,5,10, **Lvovsky et al** discloses a first output signal but has failed to teach the first output signal.

However, **Verdun et al** discloses the first output signal is an interrupt signal (fig.3 (240), 4 (360,370)) and it is for general purpose of a computer (see, abstract); determining if the first input is in a stable state before the step of asserting for a predetermined time (fig.3 (250,260, col.2, lines 49-54)); operating in a normal mode prior to monitoring (fig.3 (210)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to combine the method of outputting an interrupt signal as taught by **Verdun et al** into the device of **Lvovsky et al** since this will allow to determine the status of the device connection without requiring power down cycle of the device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,10-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2673

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2673

A.M
June 12, 2005